arXiv:1401.6952v3 [math.RT] 28 Jul 2015

On the derived Picard group of the Brauer star algebra

Alexandra Zvonareva

Abstract

In this paper we show that the derived Picard group $\mathrm{TrPic}(A)$ of the Brauer star algebra of type (n,t) is generated by shift, $\mathrm{Pic}(A)$ and equivalences $\{H_i\}_{i=1}^n$ in the case $t>1$, where H_i were shown to satisfy the relations of the braid group on the affine diagram $\widetilde{A}_{n-1}$ by Schaps and Zakay-Illouz. In the multiplicity free case we show that $\mathrm{TrPic}(A)$ is generated by a slightly bigger set.

1 Introduction

The derived Picard group $\mathrm{TrPic}(A)$ of an algebra A is the group of isomorphism classes of two-sided tilting complexes in $D^b(A\otimes A^{op})$, with the product of the classes of X and Y given by the class $X\otimes_A Y$. Equivalently $\mathrm{TrPic}(A)$ is the group of the standard autoequivalences of $D^b(A)$ modulo natural isomorphisms. It is easy to see that the derived Picard group is invariant under derived equivalence.

Rouquier and Zimmermann started the study of the derived Picard group of Brauer tree algebras [18]. In the case of multiplicity one they constructed a morphism from Artin's braid group on $n+1$ strings (n is the number of simple A-modules) to $\mathrm{TrPic}(A)$ and showed it to be an isomorphism modulo some central subgroup when $n=2$. In [21] Zimmermann generalized these results to the case of arbitrary multiplicity. Khovanov and Seidel defined an action of the Artin's braid group on the bounded derived category of a certain algebra similar to the Brauer tree algebra, according to their results the action of the Artin's braid group on the bounded derived category of a Brauer tree algebra with multiplicity one is faithful [11].

Schaps and Zakay-Illouz constructed an action of the braid group on the affine diagram $\widetilde{A}_{n-1}$ on the bounded derived category of a Brauer tree algebra with arbitrary multiplicity [19]. Muchtadi-Alamsyah showed this action to be faithful in the case of multiplicity one [14].

*This work was partially supported by RFFI 13-01-00902 and by the Chebyshev Laboratory (Department of Mathematics and Mechanics, St. Petersburg State University) under RF Government grant 11.G34.31.0026.

Schaps and Zakay-Illouz also raised the question whether in the case of multiplicity $\neq 1$ the braid generators, together with the shift and $\mathrm{Pic}(A)$, generate the entire derived Picard group and whether the homomorphism from the braid group is one-to-one. Using the technique of tilting mutations developed by Aihara and Iyama [3], [2], we answer the first question positively.

Let A be the Brauer star algebra of type (n,t), i.e. A is the Brauer tree algebra corresponding to a star with n edges and the exceptional vertex in the middle, the multiplicity of the exceptional vertex is t (for more details see section 2.1). Let $A = \oplus_{i\in\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}} P_i$ be the decomposition of A into indecomposable mutually non-isomorphic projective modules. Let $\{H_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be standard autoequivalences of of $D^b(A)$ such that

$$H_i(P_j) = \begin{cases} 0 \to 0 \to P_j, & j \neq i, i-1 \\ 0 \to 0 \to P_{i-1}, & j = i \\ P_i \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{i-1} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{i-1}, & j = i-1, \end{cases}$$

where the right most non-zero terms of the complexes above are concentrated in degree 0.

Theorem 3. *Let A be the Brauer star algebra of type (n,t), $t > 1$. Then* $\mathrm{TrPic}(A)$ *is generated by shift,* $\mathrm{Pic}(A)$ *and equivalences H_i.*

In the multiplicity free case we show that $\mathrm{TrPic}(A)$ is generated by a slightly bigger set.

Acknowledgement: I would like to thank Raphaël Rouquier for bringing my attention to tilting mutations and Mikhail Antipov, Yury Volkov and Alexander Generalov for numerous discussions and for valuable suggestions on the exposition.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Derived equivalences

Let A and B be algebras over a commutative ring R and let A and B be projective as modules over R. By A-modules we mean left A-modules. In the path algebra of a quiver the product of arrows $\xrightarrow{a}\xrightarrow{b}$ will be denoted by ab. Denote by $C(A)$ the category of complexes of A-modules, by $D^b(A)$ the bounded derived category of A, by $K^b(\mathrm{proj}-A)$ the homotopy category of bounded complexes of finitely generated projective modules. For an object T of some additive category $\mathcal{T}$ denote by $\mathrm{add}(T)$ the smallest full subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ which is closed under finite direct sums, summands and isomorphisms and contains T. The following theorem gives a necessary and sufficient condition for A and B to be derived equivalent.

Theorem 1. (Rickard, Keller, [17], [16], [10]) *The following are equivalent:*

1. *The categories $D^b(A)$ and $D^b(B)$ are equivalent as triangulated categories.*

2. *The categories* $K^b(\mathrm{proj}-A)$ *and* $K^b(\mathrm{proj}-B)$ *are equivalent as triangulated categories.*

3. *There is a complex* $T \in K^b(\mathrm{proj}-A)$ *such that*

   - $\mathrm{Hom}_{D^b(A)}(T, T[i]) = 0$ *for* $i \neq 0$,
   - $K^b(\mathrm{proj}-A)$ *is generated by* $\mathrm{add}(T)$ *as a triangulated category,*
   - $\mathrm{End}_{D^b(A)}(T) \simeq B^{op}$.

4. *There is a bounded complex* X *of* $(A \otimes B^{op})$*-modules whose restrictions to* A *and to* B^{op} *are perfect and a bounded complex* Y *of* $(B \otimes A^{op})$*-modules whose restrictions to* B *and to* A^{op} *are perfect such that* $X \otimes_B Y \simeq A$ *in* $D^b(A \otimes A^{op})$ *and* $Y \otimes_A X \simeq B$ *in* $D^b(B \otimes B^{op})$.

The complex T from (3) is called a tilting complex, X and Y from (4) are called two-sided tilting complexes inverse to each other. The complex X viewed as a complex of A-modules or as a complex of B^{op}-modules is a tilting complex. The inverse equivalences between $D^b(A)$ and $D^b(B)$ are given by $X \otimes_B -$ and $Y \otimes_A -$. Such equivalences are called standard.

Let T be a tilting complex such that $\mathrm{End}_{D^b(A)}(T) \simeq B^{op}$. There exists a two-sided tilting complex X of $(A \otimes B^{op})$-modules whose restriction to A is isomorphic to T in $D^b(A)$. If X' is another two-sided tilting complex of $(A \otimes B^{op})$-modules whose restriction to A is isomorphic to T, then there exists $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(B)$ such that $X' = X \otimes_B B_\sigma$, where B_σ is a $(B \otimes B^{op})$-module isomorphic to B but with the right action twisted by σ [18].

Definition 1. *Let* Γ *be a tree with* n *edges and a distinguished vertex, which has an assigned multiplicity* $t \in \mathbb{N}$ *(this vertex is called exceptional,* t *is called the multiplicity of the exceptional vertex). Let us fix a cyclic ordering of the edges adjacent to each vertex in* Γ *(if* Γ *is embedded into the plane, we will assume that the cyclic ordering is clockwise). In this case* Γ *is called a Brauer tree of type* (n, t).

The case when the tree is a star and the exceptional vertex is in the middle is called the Brauer star.

To a Brauer tree of type (n, t) one can associate an algebra $A(n, t)$. The algebra $A(n, t)$ is a path algebra of a quiver with relations. Let us construct a Brauer quiver Q_Γ using the Brauer tree Γ. The vertices of Q_Γ are the edges of Γ. Let i and j be two edges incident to the same vertex x in Γ, denote by $\geq$ the cyclic order of the edges incident to x. If for any h, incident to x, such that $j \geq h \geq i$ either $h = j$ or $h = i$, then there is an arrow from the vertex i to the vertex j in Q_Γ. Q_Γ has the following properties: Q_Γ is the union of oriented cycles corresponding to the vertices of Γ, each vertex of Q_Γ belongs to exactly two cycles. The cycle corresponding to the exceptional vertex is called exceptional. The arrows of Q_Γ can be divided into two families α and β in such a manner that the arrows belonging to intersecting cycles are in different families. By a slight abuse of notation arrows belonging to the family α will be denoted by α and arrows belonging to the family β will be denoted by β respectively.

Definition 2. *Let k be an algebraically closed field. The basic Brauer tree algebra $A(n,t)$, corresponding to a tree Γ of type (n,t) is isomorphic to kQ_Γ/I, where the ideal I is generated by the relations:*

1. *$\alpha\beta = 0 = \beta\alpha$ for any arrows belonging to families α and β respectively;*
2. *for any vertex i, not belonging to the exceptional cycle, $e_i\alpha^{i_\alpha}e_i = e_i\beta^{i_\beta}e_i$, where i_α, resp. i_β is the length of the α, resp. β-cycle, containing i and e_i is the idempotent corresponding to i;*
3. *for any vertex i, belonging to the exceptional α-cycle (resp. β-cycle), $e_i(\alpha^{i_\alpha})^t e_i = e_i\beta^{i_\beta}e_i$ (resp. $e_i\alpha^{i_\alpha}e_i = e_i(\beta^{i_\beta})^t e_i$).*

An algebra is called a Brauer tree algebra of type (n,t) if it is Morita equivalent to the algebra $A(n,t)$ for some Brauer tree Γ of type (n,t).

Note that the ideal I is not admissible. Let x be a leaf in Γ which is not an exceptional vertex, let i be the edge incident to x. The loop corresponding to x in Q_Γ is equal to the other cycle passing through the vertex corresponding to i, we will not draw such superfluous loops. From now on for convenience all algebras are supposed to be basic. We will assume that $n > 1$, since if $n = 1$ the corresponding Brauer tree algebra is local and by results of Rouquier and Zimmermann [18] the derived Picard group is generated by shift and $\mathrm{Pic}(A)$, this restriction has no effect on the statement of the results. Note that the Brauer tree algebras are symmetric.

Rickard showed that two Brauer tree algebras corresponding to the trees Γ and Γ' are derived equivalent if and only if their types (n,t) and (n',t') coincide [15] and it follows from the results of Gabriel and Riedtmann that this class is closed under derived equivalence [7].

Let A be a Brauer star algebra with n edges and multiplicity t. The quiver of A is of the form:



Let us denote by $\{H_i\}_{i=1}^n$ some standard autoequivalences of $D^b(A)$ which act on the projective modules as follows:

$$H_i(P_j) = \begin{cases} 0 \to 0 \to P_j, & j \neq i, i-1 \\ 0 \to 0 \to P_{i-1}, & j = i \\ P_i \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{i-1} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{i-1}, & j = i-1, \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where the right most non-zero terms of the complexes above are concentrated in degree 0 and *soc* is the morphism whose image is isomorphic to the socle of P_{i-1}.

Schaps and Zakay-Illouz studied the subgroup of the derived Picard group generated by $\{H_i\}_{i=1}^n$ [20] and showed that $\{H_i\}_{i=1}^n$ satisfy the relations of the braid group on the affine diagram $\widetilde{A}_{n-1}$.

2.2 Mutations

Let k be an algebraically closed field. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a Krull-Schmidt, k-linear, Hom-finite triangulated category. A morphism $X \xrightarrow{f} M' \in \mathcal{T}$ is called left minimal if any morphism $g : M' \to M'$ satisfying $gf = f$ is an isomorphism. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$, X an object of $\mathcal{T}$, M' an object of $\mathcal{M}$, a morphism $X \xrightarrow{f} M'$ is called a left approximation of X with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ if $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(M', M) \xrightarrow{f^*} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, M)$ is surjective for any $M \in \mathcal{M}$. Right minimal morphisms and right $\mathcal{M}$-approximations are defined dually.

$T \in \mathcal{T}$ is called silting if $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(T, T[i]) = 0$ for any $i > 0$ and $\mathcal{T}$ is generated by $\mathrm{add}(T)$ as a triangulated category. We say that a silting object T is basic if T is isomorphic to a direct sum of indecomposable objects which are mutually non-isomorphic.

Let T be a basic silting object in $\mathcal{T}$, $T = M \oplus X$, $\mathcal{M} = \mathrm{add}(M)$. Consider a triangle

$$X \xrightarrow{f} M' \longrightarrow Y \longrightarrow, \tag{2}$$

where f is a minimal left approximation of X with respect to $\mathcal{M}$. The morphism f is unique up to isomorphism, since if there is some other morphism f' which is a minimal left approximation of X with respect to $\mathcal{M}$, then $\exists h$ such that $hf = f'$ and $\exists h'$ such that $h'f' = f$, hence $f' = hh'f'$ and $f = h'hf$, but then by minimality hh' and $h'h$ are isomorphisms. The object $\mu_X^+(T) := M \oplus Y$ is called a left mutation of T with respect to X. Right mutations are defined dually and are denoted by $\mu_X^-(T)$. By results of Aihara and Iyama [3] $\mu_X^+(T)$ is again a basic silting object and $\mu_Y^-(\mu_X^+(T)) = T$ in the notation of the triangle (2). If X is indecomposable the mutation is called irreducible.

Let T, U be basic silting objects in $\mathcal{T}$. Set $T \geq U$ if $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(T, U[i]) = 0$ for any $i > 0$. The relation $\geq$ gives a partial order on the set of the isomorphism classes of basic silting object of $\mathcal{T}$ [3]. We say that U is connected (left-connected) to T if U can be obtained from T by iterated irreducible (left) mutation. A triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$ is called silting-connected if all basic silting objects in $\mathcal{T}$ are connected to each other. $\mathcal{T}$ is strongly silting-connected if for any silting objects T, U such that $T \geq U$ the object U is left-connected to T. Since in the case of a symmetric algebra $\mathrm{Hom}_{D^b(A)}(T, T[i]) \simeq D\mathrm{Hom}_{D^b(A)}(T[i], T)$, where D is the duality with respect to k [8], then any silting object in $K^b(\mathrm{proj} - A)$ is a tilting complex, in this case instead of the term silting-connected we will use the term tilting-connected.

Theorem 2. (Aihara, [2]) $K^b(\text{proj} - A)$ *is tilting-connected if* A *is a representation-finite symmetric algebra.*

Note that it also follows from [2] (Theorem 5.6 and Corollary 3.9) that in the case of representation-finite symmetric algebra the category $K^b(\text{proj} - A)$ is strongly tilting connected. So any tilting complex concentrated in non-positive degrees can be obtained from A by iterated irreducible left mutations.

A well known example of tilting mutations is the mutations of Brauer graphs or equivalently symmetric special biserial algebras. We will define it in the context of Brauer trees, i.e. we will not consider loops.

Consider a Brauer tree algebra A as a tilting complex over itself. $A = (\bigoplus_{i=1,i\neq j}^{n} P_i) \oplus P_j$. First, assume that j is incident to a leaf. Consider a left mutation

$$\mu^+_{P_j}(A) = (\bigoplus_{i=1,i\neq j}^{n} P_i) \oplus (P_j \xrightarrow{\beta} P_l)$$

of A with respect to P_j (the corresponding approximation is taken with respect to $\text{add}(\bigoplus_{i=1,i\neq j}^{n} P_i)$), where P_l is the projective modules corresponding to the edge in the Brauer tree which follows j in the cyclic ordering of the edges incident to the same vertex and β corresponds to the arrow from j to l. The Brauer tree of A is on the left-hand side and the Brauer tree of $\text{End}_{D^b(A)}(\mu^+_{P_j}(A))^{op}$ is on the right-hand side, the edge corresponding to $P_j \xrightarrow{\beta} P_l$ will be also denoted by j.

In the case where j is not incident to a leaf in the Brauer tree of A

$$\mu^+_{P_j}(A) = (\bigoplus_{i=1,i\neq j}^{n} P_i) \oplus (P_j \xrightarrow{f} P_m \oplus P_l),$$

where P_m and P_l are the projective modules corresponding to the edges in the Brauer tree which follow j in the cyclic ordering of the edges incident to the same vertices and $f = \binom{\alpha}{\beta}$, where α and β correspond to the arrows from j to m and from j to l respectively. And on the level of Brauer trees we have:



As far as we know these moves were first introduced in [12] and [9] but were also studied in [4], [1], [6], [13]. The mutations $\mu^-_{P_j}(A)$ are defined dually and corresponds to the move in the opposite direction, i.e. from the right-hand side to the left-hand side. The tilting complexes of the form $\mu^{\pm}_{P_j}(A)$, where A is an arbitrary Brauer tree algebra, will sometimes be called elementary. Mutations of an edge incident to a leaf will be called the mutations of type I and mutations of an edge not incident to a leaf will be called the mutations of type II. Note also that these mutations involve only edges: the exceptional vertex stays unchanged.

3 Mutations and the derived Picard group

Denote by $\mathrm{Pic}(A)$ the Picard group of an algebra A, i.e. the group of isomorphism classes of invertible $A \otimes A^{op}$-modules or equivalently the group of Morita autoequivalences of A modulo natural isomorphisms. The group $\mathrm{Out}(A)$ of outer autoequivalences of A coincides with $\mathrm{Pic}(A)$ [5] and is clearly a subgroup of $\mathrm{TrPic}(A)$. If $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(A)$, then there is an invertible $A \otimes A^{op}$-module A_σ, where A_σ is an $(A \otimes A^{op})$-module isomorphic to A as a left module but with the right action twisted by σ. A bimodule A_σ is isomorphic to $A_{\sigma'}$ if and only if σ coincides with σ' modulo the subgroup of inner automorphisms. Consider equivalences $F, F' : D^b(B) \to D^b(A)$. Assume that they are given by two-sided tilting complexes X, X' whose restriction to A is a tilting complex T, then $X' = X \otimes_B B_\sigma$ for some $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(B)$ [18].

The proof of the following statement is trivial.

Lemma 1. *Let $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ be two triangulated categories, $F : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ a triangular equivalence, $\mathcal{M}$ a subcategory of $\mathcal{A}$, $X \in \mathcal{A}$ and let $X \xrightarrow{f} M'$ ($M' \xrightarrow{f} X$) be a minimal left (resp. right) approximation of X with respect to $\mathcal{M}$, then $F(X) \xrightarrow{F(f)} F(M')$ ($F(M') \xrightarrow{F(f)} F(X)$) is a minimal left (resp. right) approximation of $F(X)$ with respect to $F(\mathcal{M})$.*

Let A be a symmetric algebra and let T be a basic tilting complex over A. Denote by $B^{op} = \mathrm{End}_{D^b(A)}(T)$ and by F a standard equivalence such that $F(B) \simeq T$, where $F : D^b(B) \to D^b(A)$. Let $T = M \oplus X$, where X is indecomposable, let $\mu^{\pm}_X(T)$ be a tilting complex obtained from T by right or left mutation. Denote by $C^{op} = \mathrm{End}_{D^b(A)}(\mu^{\pm}_X(T))$ and by $G : D^b(C) \to D^b(A)$ a standard equivalence such that $G(C) \simeq \mu^{\pm}_X(T)$. Consider B as a tilting complex over itself. Summands of T and of B are in one to one correspondence under F, we will denote by P_X the indecomposable projective B-module corresponding to X, a tilting complex $\mu^{\pm}_{P_X}(B)$ is obtained from B by mutation with respect to P_X.

Lemma 2. *In the above notation* $\mathrm{End}_{D^b(B)}(\mu^{\pm}_{P_X}(B)) \simeq C^{op}$.

Proof. Consider only the case of right mutations. $C^{op} = \mathrm{End}_{D^b(A)}(M \oplus Y)$, $\mathrm{End}_{D^b(B)}(\mu^-_{P_X}(B)) = \mathrm{End}_{D^b(B)}(F^{-1}(M) \oplus Y')$, where

$$Y' \to N \to P_X \to$$

is a triangle, and $N \to P_X$ is a minimal right approximation of P_X with respect to add$(F^{-1}(M))$. F^{-1} is a triangular equivalence, and due to the previous lemma $F^{-1}(Y) \simeq Y'$, so $\mathrm{End}_{D^b(B)}(\mu^-_{P_X}(B)) \simeq \mathrm{End}_{D^b(B)}(F^{-1}(M \oplus Y))$ and the assertion follows. □

Let's denote by $H : D^b(C) \to D^b(B)$ a standard equivalence such that $H(C) \simeq \mu^{\pm}_{P_X}(B)$.

Lemma 3. *There exists $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(C)$ such that $G \simeq F \circ H \circ (C_\sigma \otimes_C -)$.*

Proof. By the previous lemma we have the following diagram:



We need to check that the action of G and $F \circ H$ on C coincides. We will deal only with the case of right mutation again. $G(C) = \mu^-_X(T)$. Whereas, $H(C) = \mu^-_{P_X}(B) \simeq F^{-1}(M) \oplus Y'$. Hence $F(H(C)) \simeq M \oplus F(Y')$, but $F(Y') \simeq Y$, so $F(H(C)) \simeq M \oplus Y = \mu^-_X(T)$. □

We will need the following technical lemma, the proof is straightforward.

Lemma 4. *Let $V = \cdots \to X'' \xrightarrow{x} X \xrightarrow{g} Y \xrightarrow{h} Z \to 0 \to \cdots$, $W = \cdots \to 0 \to X' \xrightarrow{g'} Y \xrightarrow{h'} Z' \xrightarrow{z} Z'' \to \cdots$ be two objects of $D^b(A)$. Let*



be a morphism $f \in D^b(A)$, then $Cone(f) \simeq \cdots \to X'' \xrightarrow{x} X \xrightarrow{w} X' \xrightarrow{hg'} Z \xrightarrow{v} Z' \xrightarrow{z} Z'' \to \cdots$, where Z' is concentrated in the same degree as in W.

3.1 The standard construction of a tree

In this section we will fix a standard way to build a tree from a star using mutations. The procedure will involve only mutation of type I (see section 2.2).

Let Γ be a Brauer tree of type (n, t). Let us assume that the root of Γ is chosen in the exceptional vertex, and that Γ is embedded into the plane in such a manner that all non-root vertices are situated on the plane lower than the root according to their level (the further from the root, the lower, all vertices of the same level lie on a horizontal line). The edges around vertices are ordered clockwise.

Let A be a Brauer star algebra. If the corresponding tree is embedded into the plane as described above, let its edges be labelled from left ro right. $A =$

$\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} P_i$, where P_i are indecomposable projective modules. We are going to perform a series of irreducible mutations of A, after the r-th mutation we are going to obtain a tilting complex $T^r = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} T_i^r$. The summands of T^r are labelled as follows: $T^0 = A$, $T_i^0 = P_i$. Each mutation changes only one summand of the tilting complex T^{r-1}, say T_j^{r-1}. Denote by T_j^r the summand which was changed by the r-th mutation, $T_i^r := T_i^{r-1}$, $i \neq j$. All this allows us to write a composition of mutations. Denote by $\mu_j^{\pm}$ the mutation which changes T_j^{r-1}. The Brauer tree of $\mathrm{End}_{D^b(A)}(T^r)^{op}$ can be obtained by the mutation of the Brauer tree of T^{r-1}, for example by Lemma 2.

Note also, that since $\mathrm{End}_{D^b(A)}(T^r)^{op}$ is a Brauer tree algebra it is easy to compute the minimal left approximation of T_j^r with respect to other summands of T^r. If the edge j corresponding to T_j^r is not incident to a leaf in the Brauer tree of $\mathrm{End}_{D^b(A)}(T^r)^{op}$, let T_m^r and T_l^r be the summands corresponding to m and l, the edges following j in the cyclic ordering and let f be a morphism corresponding to two arrows in $\mathrm{End}_{D^b(A)}(T^r)^{op}$, then by Lemma 1 the morphism $T_j^r \xrightarrow{f} T_m^r \oplus T_l^r$ is a minimal left approximation of T_j^r with respect to other summands of T^r. If j is incident to a leaf, then $T_j^r \xrightarrow{f} T_l^r$ is a minimal left approximation of T_j^r, where l is the only edge following j in the cyclic ordering and f is the corresponding arrow. We will say that we mutate j along the edges m and l or along the the edge l respectively. In addition if a component of f does not belong to the exceptional cycle, then any non-zero morphism can be set as this component.

Let Γ be a Brauer tree of type (n, t), assume $n > 1$. Let us number the edges of the tree Γ as follows: put 1 on the left-hand edge incident to the root. If the edge with label 1 is not incident to a leaf, put 2 on the edge incident to its non-exceptional end which is the previous edge coming before the edge with label 1 in the cyclic ordering; if the edge with label 1 is incident to a leaf, put 2 on the only edge which is the previous edge coming before the edge with label 1 in the cyclic ordering. Assume that the label i is assigned to some edge, if it is not incident to a leaf, put the label $i + 1$ on the edge of the lower level which is the previous edge coming before the edge with label i in the cyclic ordering (e.g.: edges 2 and 3 in Example 1); if the edge with the label i is incident to a leaf, put the label $i + 1$ on the only edge which is the previous edge coming before the edge with label i in the cyclic ordering (e.g.: edges 3 and 4 in Example 1); if this edge has a label already, find the edge l with the biggest label which has an unlabelled edge incident to its upper end x, put the label $i + 1$ on the previous edge coming before l in the cyclic ordering around x (e.g.: edges 4 and 5 in Example 1). Note that the same labelling can be obtained using Green walk or depth-first search algorithm.

Example 1. *The following labelling of the Brauer tree* Γ *is standard:*



Let $\phi_\Gamma : \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \to \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ be a function which assigns to a label i the length of the shortest path from this edge to the exceptional vertex, or equivalently the level of the edge with label i (assuming that the edges incident to the exceptional vertex belong to the level 0).

Lemma 5. *Let Γ be a Brauer tree of type (n, t) labelled as described above. Let $T = (\mu_n^+)^{\phi_\Gamma(n)} \circ (\mu_{n-1}^+)^{\phi_\Gamma(n-1)} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_1^+)^{\phi_\Gamma(1)}(A)$. Then the Brauer tree of $\mathrm{End}_{D^b(A)}(T)^{op}$ is Γ.*

Proof. Since $T = (\mu_n^+)^{\phi_\Gamma(n)} \circ (\mu_{n-1}^+)^{\phi_\Gamma(n-1)} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_1^+)^{\phi_\Gamma(1)}(A)$, first we move edges with label 1 as described in section 2.2, then with label 2 and so on. Thus we can build the tree of $\mathrm{End}_{D^b(A)}(T)^{op}$ by induction on the label. The desired description of the tree of $\mathrm{End}_{D^b(A)}(T)^{op}$ follows from the description of the moves and from the construction. □

Example 2. *Let T be the Brauer tree from Example 1, $T = (\mu_4^+)^2 \circ (\mu_3^+)^2 \circ \mu_2^+(A)$*



And the summands of T are:

$$P_1$$

$$P_2 \xrightarrow{\beta} P_1$$

$$P_3 \xrightarrow{\beta} P_2$$

$$P_4 \xrightarrow{\beta^2} P_2$$

$$P_5.$$

Let us compute the tilting complex T from the lemma. Denote by $\psi_\Gamma : \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \backslash \phi_\Gamma^{-1}(0) \to \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$ the function which assigns to a label i the label of the edge from a higher level which shares a common vertex with the edge i. Let us assume that in the complexes $0 \to P_i \to 0$, $0 \to P_i \to P_j \to 0$, P_i is concentrated in degree 0, (note that we are using the cohomological notation).

Lemma 6. *Let Γ be a Brauer tree of type (n,t) labelled as described above. Let T be the complex from Lemma 5, then T is of the form $T=\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} T_i$, where*

$$T_i=\begin{cases} P_i, & \phi_\Gamma(i)=0,\\ (P_i \xrightarrow{\beta^{i-\psi(i)}} P_{\psi(i)})[\phi_\Gamma(i)], & \phi_\Gamma(i)\neq 0.\end{cases}$$

Proof. Recall that the arrows in the Brauer star algebra were denoted by β. Since $T=(\mu_n^+)^{\phi_\Gamma(n)}\circ(\mu_{n-1}^+)^{\phi_\Gamma(n-1)}\circ\cdots\circ(\mu_1^+)^{\phi_\Gamma(1)}(A)$, first we mutate the summand with label 1, then with label 2 and so on, hence we can compute T by induction on the label. $\phi_\Gamma(1)=0$, hence $T_1=P_1$. If the edge with label 1 is not incident to a leaf, then 2 is on the edge incident to its non-exceptional end which is the previous edge coming before the edge with label 1 in the cyclic ordering, $\phi_\Gamma(2)=1$ and we should apply μ_2^+ to A. Hence $T_2=P_2\xrightarrow{\beta}P_1$ concentrated in degrees -1 and 0, as desired. If the edge with label 1 is incident to a leaf, then 2 is on the edge incident to the exceptional vertex, $\phi_\Gamma(2)=0$, hence $T_2=P_2$.

Assume that T_i is computed. If the edge with label $i+1$ is incident to the exceptional vertex, then $\phi_\Gamma(i+1)=0$ and $T_{i+1}=P_{i+1}$.

Assume the label $i+1$ is assigned to some edge not incident to the exceptional vertex. Denote by $x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_{\phi_\Gamma(i+1)}=\psi(i+1)$ the edges from the shortest path from the exceptional vertex to $i+1$ indexed by numbers from 1 to $\phi_\Gamma(i+1)$. By assumption

$$T^r=(\mu_i^+)^{\phi_\Gamma(i)}\circ(\mu_{i-1}^+)^{\phi_\Gamma(i-1)}\circ\cdots\circ(\mu_1^+)^{\phi_\Gamma(1)}(A)=\bigoplus_{k=1}^{i}T_k\oplus\bigoplus_{k=i+1}^{n}P_k.$$

$$T_{x_1}=P_{x_1},\ T_{x_k}\simeq(P_{x_k}\xrightarrow{\beta^{x_k-x_{k-1}}}P_{x_{k-1}})[\phi_\Gamma(x_k)].$$

We want to apply $(\mu_{i+1}^+)^{\phi_\Gamma(i+1)}$ to T^r, or equivalently mutate P_{i+1} along T_{x_1}, $T_{x_2},\ldots,T_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(i+1)}}$. Clearly $T_{i+1}^{r+1}\simeq P_{i+1}\xrightarrow{\beta^{i+1-x_1}}P_{x_1}$. The minimal left approximation of T_{i+1}^{r+1} with respect to other summands of T^{r+1} is

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_{i+1} & \xrightarrow{\beta^{i+1-x_1}} & P_{x_1}\\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \beta^{i+1-x_2}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle Id}\\ P_{x_2} & \xrightarrow{\beta^{x_2-x_1}} & P_{x_1}. \end{array}$$

By Lemma 4 $T_{i+1}^{r+2}\simeq(P_{i+1}\xrightarrow{\beta^{i+1-x_2}}P_{x_2})[2]$, and by iterated application of Lemma 4 we get the desired result. □

Remark 1. *Complexes similar to T from Lemma 5 were already studied in the works of Schaps and Zakay-Illouz (see for example [20]).*

3.2 Main result

Let A be a Brauer star algebra of type (n,t). Denote by $\mathcal{R}$ the subgroup of $\mathrm{TrPic}(A)$ generated by shift, $\mathrm{Pic}(A)$ and equivalences H_i (see formula (1)).

Remark 2. (a) *The subgroup $\mathcal{R}$ coincides with the subgroup considered in [19], it was also shown there that this subgroup has an action of the braid group on the diagram $\widetilde{A}_{n-1}$, the homomorphism is defined by sending half-twists to H_i's. In [14] this action was shown to be faithful for $t = 1$.*

(b) *There is an outer automorphism in* $\mathrm{Pic}(A)$ *corresponding to the rotation of the Brauer star and sending H_i to H_{i+1} by conjugation, so one can define $\mathcal{R}$ as a subgroup of* $\mathrm{TrPic}(A)$ *generated by shift,* $\mathrm{Pic}(A)$ *and equivalence H_1.*

(c) $H_i(A) \simeq (\mu_i^+)^2(A)$*: for a complex*

$$P_i \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{i-1} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{i-1}$$

there are a triangle

$$P_i \xrightarrow{f'} M' \to Cone(f') \to,$$

where $M' = P_{i-1}$, $f' = \beta$ is a minimal left approximation of P_i with respect to $\mathrm{add}(\bigoplus_{j=1,j\neq i}^{n} P_j)$ *and $Cone(f') \simeq P_i \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{i-1}$; and a triangle*

$$Cone(f') \xrightarrow{f''} M'' \to Cone(f'') \to,$$

where $M'' = P_{i-1}$, $f'' = (0, soc)$ is a minimal left approximation of $Cone(f')$ with respect to $\mathrm{add}(\bigoplus_{j=1,j\neq i}^{n} P_j)$ *and*

$$Cone(f'') \simeq (P_i \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{i-1} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{i-1}).$$

Theorem 3. *If $t > 1$, then* $\mathrm{TrPic}(A) = \mathcal{R}$.

Proof. We only need to show that the embedding of $\mathcal{R}$ into $\mathrm{TrPic}(A)$ is surjective.

1st step: It is sufficient to prove that for any tilting complex T there is an element from $\mathcal{R}$ which sends indecomposable projective A-modules to the summands of T.

Indeed, any element X from $\mathrm{TrPic}(A)$ restricts to some tilting complex T such that $\mathrm{End}_{D^b(A)}(T)^{op} \simeq A$; any other element from $\mathrm{TrPic}(A)$ which restricts to the same complex, differs from X by an element from $\mathrm{Pic}(A)$, hence by an element from $\mathcal{R}$.

2nd step: If $T = (\mu_{j_q}^{\pm})^2 \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{j_1}^{\pm})^2(A)$, then there exists an element from $\mathcal{R}$ which sends the indecomposable projective A-modules to the summands of T.

Indeed, let F be some autoequivalence of $D^b(A)$, let us compute $F(H_i(P_j))$. Since $H_i(P_j) = P_j$ for $j \neq i, i-1$, we have $F(H_i(P_j)) = F(P_j)$ for $j \neq i, i-1$. $H_i(P_i) = P_{i-1}$, hence $F(H_i(P_i)) = F(P_{i-1})$. For the complex $H_i(P_{i-1})$ there are triangles

$$P_i \xrightarrow{f'} M' \to Cone(f') \to$$

and

$$Cone(f') \xrightarrow{f''} M'' \to Cone(f'') \to,$$

where f' and f'' are minimal left approximations of P_i and $Cone(f')$ with respect to $\mathrm{add}(\bigoplus_{j=1,j\neq i}^{n} P_j)$, hence by Lemma 1 for the complex $F(H_i(P_{i-1}))$ there are triangles

$$F(P_i) \xrightarrow{g'} N' \to Cone(g') \to$$

and

$$Cone(g') \xrightarrow{g''} N'' \to Cone(g'') \to,$$

where $g' = F(f')$ and $g'' = F(f'')$ are minimal left approximations of $F(P_i)$ and $Cone(g') \simeq F(Cone(f'))$ with respect to $\mathrm{add}(\bigoplus_{j=1,j\neq i}^{n} F(P_j))$ and $F(H_i(P_{i-1})) \simeq Cone(g'')$. So $F(H_i(P_{i-1}))$ is a double mutation of $F(P_i)$ with respect to other summands of $F(A)$. Consider an autoequivalence such that

$$H_i'(P_j) = \begin{cases} P_j \to 0 \to 0, & j \neq i, i-1 \\ P_i \to 0 \to 0, & j = i-1 \\ P_i \xrightarrow{soc} P_i \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{i-1}, & j = i. \end{cases}$$

Note that $H_i'(A) \simeq (\mu_{i-1}^{-})^2(A)$, i.e. for $H_i'(P_i)$ there are two triangles from the definition of the right mutation. Analogously to the previous argument we get that to apply some autoequivalence G to $H_i'(A)$ is the same as to compute a double right mutation of $G(P_{i-1})$ with respect to other summands of $G(A)$. So $H_i'(H_i(P_j)) = P_j$ and $H_i(H_i'(P_j)) = P_j$ for any j, hence the action of $(H_i)^{-1}$ on the projective A-modules coincides with the action of H_i'.

Assume that some tilting complex T can be obtained from A applying squares of mutations, i.e. $T = (\mu_{j_q}^{\pm})^2 \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{j_1}^{\pm})^2(A)$. By induction on q we get that there is an element from $\mathcal{R}$, which sends indecomposable projective A-modules to the summands of T.

3rd step: Assume that T is concentrated in non-positive degrees. By results of Aihara [2] $T = \mu_{i_s}^{+} \circ \cdots \circ \mu_{i_{r+1}}^{+} \circ \mu_{i_r}^{+} \circ \mu_{i_{r-1}}^{+} \circ \cdots \circ \mu_{i_2}^{+} \circ \mu_{i_1}^{+}(A)$ for some $(i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_s)$. Denote by $T^r := \mu_{i_r}^{+} \circ \mu_{i_{r-1}}^{+} \circ \cdots \circ \mu_{i_2}^{+} \circ \mu_{i_1}^{+}(A)$ and by Γ^r the Brauer tree of $\mathrm{End}_{D^b(A)}(T^r)^{op}$. Note that if the Brauer star is labelled in the standard way, Γ^r has a natural labelling of edges associated to the series of mutations $\mu_{i_r}^{+} \circ \mu_{i_{r-1}}^{+} \circ \cdots \circ \mu_{i_2}^{+} \circ \mu_{i_1}^{+}(A)$, which may not coincide with the standard labelling.

By Lemma 5 if A is a Brauer star algebra with the standard labelling, then the opposite ring of the endomorphism ring of $(\mu_n^{+})^{\phi_{\Gamma^r}(n)} \circ (\mu_{n-1}^{+})^{\phi_{\Gamma^r}(n-1)} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_1^{+})^{\phi_{\Gamma^r}(1)}(A)$ is a Brauer tree algebra associated to Γ^r with the standard labelling. If the natural labelling ρ_r of tree Γ^r is not standard, then there is some permutation τ_r one needs to apply to the standard labelling of Γ^r to obtain ρ_r. Applying τ_r to the standard labelling of the Brauer star we obtain the Brauer star with some labelling, which will also be denoted by ρ_r. Applying τ_r to the indices of $(\mu_n^{+})^{\phi_{\Gamma^r}(n)} \circ (\mu_{n-1}^{+})^{\phi_{\Gamma^r}(n-1)} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_1^{+})^{\phi_{\Gamma^r}(1)}(A)$ one gets a series of mutations needed to obtain the Brauer tree Γ^r with the labelling ρ_r from the Brauer star with the labelling ρ_r. We will denote this series of mutations by $\tilde{\mu}^r$

for the natural labelling ρ_r of Γ^r. By $\tilde{\mu}^{-r} := (\tilde{\mu}^r)^{-1}$ we will denote the series of mutations $(\mu^-_{\tau_r(1)})^{\phi_{\Gamma^r}(\tau_r(1))} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu^-_{\tau_r(n-1)})^{\phi_{\Gamma^r}(\tau_r(n-1))} \circ (\mu^-_{\tau_r(n)})^{\phi_{\Gamma^r}(\tau_r(n))}$. If A^{ρ_r} is a Brauer star algebra with the labelling ρ_r and B^r is the Brauer tree algebra of Γ^r with natural labelling, then $\tilde{\mu}^{-r} \circ \tilde{\mu}^r(A^{\rho_r}) = A^{\rho_r}$ and $\tilde{\mu}^r \circ \tilde{\mu}^{-r}(B^r) = B^r$.

$$T = \mu^+_{i_s} \circ \cdots \circ \mu^+_{i_{r+1}} \circ \mu^+_{i_r} \circ \mu^+_{i_{r-1}} \circ \cdots \circ \mu^+_{i_2} \circ \mu^+_{i_1}(A) =$$

$$= \mu^+_{i_s} \circ \cdots \circ \tilde{\mu}^{r+1} \circ \tilde{\mu}^{-(r+1)} \circ \mu^+_{i_{r+1}} \circ \tilde{\mu}^r \circ \tilde{\mu}^{-r} \circ \mu^+_{i_r} \circ \tilde{\mu}^{r-1} \circ \tilde{\mu}^{-(r-1)} \circ \mu^+_{i_{r-1}} \circ \dots$$
$$\circ \tilde{\mu}^2 \circ \tilde{\mu}^{-2} \circ \mu^+_{i_2} \circ \tilde{\mu}^1 \circ \tilde{\mu}^{-1} \circ \mu^+_{i_1}(A).$$

By the 2nd step of the proof of the theorem follows from the fact that any tilting complex T can be obtained from A applying squares of mutations and the shift, thus we have proved the following:

It is sufficient to express as series of squares of mutations of A only complexes of the form $\tilde{\mu}^{-(r+1)} \circ \mu^+_{i_{r+1}} \circ \tilde{\mu}^r(A^{\rho_r})$, $\tilde{\mu}^{-1} \circ \mu^+_{i_1}(A)$ and $\mu^+_{i_s} \circ \tilde{\mu}^{s-1}(A^{\rho_{s-1}})$.

Note that, the opposite rings of the endomorphism rings of these tilting complexes are isomorphic to the Brauer star algebra.

4th step: The complexes of the form $\tilde{\mu}^{-(r+1)} \circ \mu^+_{i_{r+1}} \circ \tilde{\mu}^r(A^{\rho_r})$, $\tilde{\mu}^{-1} \circ \mu^+_{i_1}(A)$ and $\mu^+_{i_s} \circ \tilde{\mu}^{s-1}(A^{\rho_{s-1}})$ can be expressed as series of squares of mutations of A.

Indeed, $\tilde{\mu}^{-1} \circ \mu^+_{i_1}(A) = A$ and $\mu^+_{i_s} \circ \tilde{\mu}^{s-1}(A^{\rho_{s-1}}) = (\mu^+_{i_s})^2(A^{\rho_{s-1}})$, here we use the fact that $t > 1$ and that the exceptional vertex is distinguished by the multiplicity. So it remains to check the condition for $\tilde{\mu}^{-(r+1)} \circ \mu^+_{i_{r+1}} \circ \tilde{\mu}^r(A^{\rho_r})$ for any tree Γ^r and any mutation $\mu^+_{i_{r+1}}$. Applying τ_r^{-1}we are going to perform a suitable series of mutations with the standard Brauer star. This is done in sections 3.3 and 3.4.

Thus the theorem follows. □

Remark 3. *The question of the relations in $\mathcal{R}$ remains open.*

3.3 Mutation of type I

Note that these computations are also valid for $t = 1$. Often we will omit the degrees is which the complexes are concentrated, but will take them into account.

Without loss of generality assume that Γ^r is a tree with a standard labelling, so $\tilde{\mu}^r(A)$ is a series of mutations described in section 3.1. Assume also that $j := i_{r+1}$ is an edge incident to a vertex x of degree one in Γ^r, so μ^+_j is a mutation of type I. In order to compute $\tilde{\mu}^{-(r+1)} \circ \mu^+_j \circ \tilde{\mu}^r(A)$ we are going to consider the following three cases: 1) x is not the root and there is an edge of the same level as j, following j in the cyclic ordering; 2) x is not the root and there is no edge of the same level as j, following j in the cyclic ordering; 3) x is the root.

Case 1: x is not the root and there is an edge l of the same level as j, following j in the cyclic ordering in Γ^r.

Claim: Γ^{r+1} *is a tree with the standard labelling,* $\mu_j^+ \circ \tilde{\mu}^r(A)$ *is isomorphic to the standard tilting complex from Lemma 6, associated to this tree, and hence* $\tilde{\mu}^{-(r+1)} \circ \mu_j^+ \circ \tilde{\mu}^r(A) \simeq A$.

Proof. It is clear that Γ^{r+1} is a tree with the standard labelling. Assume that j is not incident to the root, denote by q the edge of the higher level incident to both j and l in Γ^r. Since $\phi_{\Gamma^r}(j) = \phi_{\Gamma^r}(l)$ and $\psi(j) = \psi(l) = q$ in Γ^r the minimal left approximation f of T_j^r has the form:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_j^r \simeq & & P_j \xrightarrow{\beta^{j-q}} P_q \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow \beta^{j-l} \quad \downarrow \mathrm{Id} \\ T_l^r \simeq & & P_l \xrightarrow{\beta^{l-q}} P_q, \end{array}$$

since $\dim_{\mathrm{k}}\mathrm{Hom}_{D^b(A)}(T_j^r, T_l^r) = 1$ and any non-zero morphism is a minimal left approximation. $T_j^{r+1} \simeq (P_j \xrightarrow{\beta^{j-l}} P_l)[\phi_{\Gamma^r}(j) + 1]$ by Lemma 4, as desired, since $\phi_{\Gamma^{r+1}}(j) = \phi_{\Gamma^r}(j) + 1$ and $\psi(j) = l$ in Γ^{r+1}.

If j is incident to the root in Γ^r, l is also incident to the root in Γ^r and $T_j^{r+1} = (P_j \overset{\beta^{j-l}}{\to} P_l)[1]$. □

Case 2: x is not the root and there is no edge of the same level as j, following j in the cyclic ordering (in Γ^r). In order to simplify the notation set $\phi_\Gamma = \phi_{\Gamma^r}$.

Claim: $\tilde{\mu}^{-(r+1)} \circ \mu_j^+ \circ \tilde{\mu}^r(A) \simeq (\mu_j^+)^2(A)$.

Proof. Let $T^r = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n T_i$ be the tilting complex from Lemma 6, and let j be not incident to the root. Denote by $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)} = \psi(j) = j - 1$ the edges which belong to the shortest path from the exceptional vertex to the edge labelled j, indexed by numbers from 1 to $\phi_\Gamma(j)$. T_j^{r+1} is the cone of the following morphism (since $\dim_{\mathrm{k}}\mathrm{Hom}_{D^b(A)}(T_j^r, T_{j-1}^r) = 1$ any non-zero morphism is a minimal left approximation)

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} P_j & \xrightarrow{\beta} & P_{j-1} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow soc & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & P_{j-1} & \xrightarrow{\beta^a} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}}, \end{array}$$

where *soc* is the morphism with the image equal to the socle of P_{j-1}, and $a = j - 1 - x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}$. Hence

$$T_j^{r+1} \simeq P_j \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{j-1} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{j-1} \xrightarrow{\beta^a} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}},$$

where $P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}}$ is concentrated in the same degree as in T^r. If the edge $j-1$ is incident to the root, then $P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}} = 0$ and

$$T_j^{r+1} \simeq P_j \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{j-1} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{j-1}.$$

Let us apply the part of the series of mutations $\tilde{\mu}^{-(r+1)}$, which contains the mutation with indices greater than j and with index $j-1$. For the corresponding r' we get that

$$T^{r'} \simeq \bigoplus_{i=1}^{j-2} T_i \oplus (P_j \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{j-1} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{j-1} \xrightarrow{\beta^a} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}}) \oplus P_{j-1} \bigoplus_{i=j+1}^{n} P_i.$$

Let us apply μ_j^-: $T_j^{r'+1}$ is the cone of the following morphism shifted by -1,

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & 0 & \longrightarrow & 0 & \longrightarrow & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}} & \xrightarrow{\beta^b} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-2}} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathrm{Id} & & \downarrow \\ P_j & \xrightarrow{\beta} & P_{j-1} & \xrightarrow{soc} & P_{j-1} & \xrightarrow{\beta^a} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}} & \longrightarrow & 0, \end{array}$$

where $b = x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1} - x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-2}$. By Lemma 4

$$T_j^{r'+1} \simeq P_j \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{j-1} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{j-1} \xrightarrow{\beta^{a+b}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-2}},$$

where $P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-2}}$ is concentrated in the same degree as in T^r. By iterated application of Lemma 4

$$T_j \simeq P_j \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{j-1} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{j-1},$$

where P_j is concentrated in degree -2 (from here on by T we will denote the complex $\tilde{\mu}^{-(r+1)} \circ \mu_j^+ \circ \tilde{\mu}^r(A)$ and by T_j we will denote its summand corresponding to the edge with label j).

Applying the rest of the series of mutations $\tilde{\mu}^{-(r+1)}$, we get $T_i \simeq P_i$ for $i < j-1$, hence $(\mu_j^+)^2(A)$. □

Case 3: x is the root, $j = 1$.

Let l be the edge following j in the cyclic ordering around the non-root vertex incident to j in Γ^r.

$\Gamma = \Gamma^r$ and Γ^{r+1} are roughly of the following form (labels $\{2, \ldots, l-1\}$ and $\{l+1, \ldots, n\}$ are on arbitrary trees):



Claim: $\tilde{\mu}^{-(r+1)} \circ \mu_j^+ \circ \tilde{\mu}^r(A) \simeq ((\mu_1^-)^2 \circ (\mu_2^-)^2 \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{l-1}^-)^2(A))[1]$.

Proof. Let T^r be the complex from Lemma 6, corresponding to the tree Γ^r. Thus $T_1^r = P_1$ and $T_l^r \simeq P_l \xrightarrow{\beta^{l-1}} P_1$. The minimal left approximation of P_1 is the morphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & P_1 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathrm{Id} \\ P_l & \xrightarrow{\beta^{l-1}} & P_1. \end{array}$$

Its cone is $P_l[1]$.

The levels of edges in Γ^{r+1} are: $\phi_{\Gamma^{r+1}}(2) = \phi_\Gamma(2)+1, \ldots, \phi_{\Gamma^{r+1}}(l-1) = \phi_\Gamma(l-1)+1$, $\phi_{\Gamma^{r+1}}(l+1) = \phi_\Gamma(l+1)-1, \ldots, \phi_{\Gamma^{r+1}}(n) = \phi_\Gamma(n)-1$, hence the sequence of mutations $\tilde{\mu}^{-(r+1)}$ is of the form

$$\mu_l^- \circ (\mu_2^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(2)+1} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{l-1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(l-1)+1} \circ (\mu_{l+1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(l+1)-1} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_n^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(n)-1}.$$

Let us apply this sequence to the complex T^{r+1}.

Application of $(\mu_n^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(n)-1}$: note that the edge n is pendant; if n is not incident to j, then after the application of $(\mu_n^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(n)-2}$ the edge n becomes incident to j, the complex corresponding to that edge is $P_n \xrightarrow{\beta^{n-l}} P_l$. The minimal right approximation of this complex is the morphism from $P_l[1]$ induced by $P_l \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Id}} P_l$, by Lemma 4 its cone is isomorphic to $P_n[2]$, hence $T_n \simeq P_n[1]$.

Similarly applying $(\mu_{l+1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(l+1)-1} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{n-1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(n-1)-1}$ we get that

$$T_{n-1} \simeq P_{n-1}[1], \ldots, T_{l+1} \simeq P_{l+1}[1].$$

Application of $(\mu_{l-1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(l-1)+1}$: note that the edge $l-1$ is pendant; if $l-1$ is not incident to l, then after the application of $(\mu_{l-1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(l-1)-1}$, the edge $l-1$ becomes incident to l, the complex corresponding to that edge is $P_{l-1} \xrightarrow{\beta^{l-2}} P_j$. The minimal right approximation of this complex is the morphism (β, Id) from $P_l \xrightarrow{\beta^{l-1}} P_j$. By Lemma 4 its cone is isomorphic to $P_l \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{l-1}$. The minimal right approximation of the shift of this complex is the morphism from $P_l[1]$ induced by $P_l \xrightarrow{soc} P_l$, its cone is isomorphic to

$$P_l \xrightarrow{soc} P_l \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{l-1},$$

after the shift P_{l-1} is concentrated in 1, hence

$$T_{l-1} \simeq (P_l \xrightarrow{soc} P_l \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{l-1})[1].$$

Similarly applying $(\mu_2^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(2)+1} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{l-2}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(l-2)+1}$ we get that

$$T_{l-2} \simeq (P_l \xrightarrow{soc} P_l \xrightarrow{\beta^2} P_{l-2})[1],$$

$$\cdots$$

$$T_2 \simeq (P_l \xrightarrow{soc} P_l \xrightarrow{\beta^{l-2}} P_2)[1].$$

Let us apply μ_l^-: the minimal right approximation of $P_l \xrightarrow{\beta^{l-j}} P_j$ is the morphism from $P_l[1]$, induced by $P_l \xrightarrow{soc} P_l$, its cone is isomorphic to

$$P_l \xrightarrow{soc} P_l \xrightarrow{\beta^{l-j}} P_j,$$

after the shift P_j is concentrated in 1, hence

$$T_l \simeq (P_l \xrightarrow{soc} P_l \xrightarrow{\beta^{l-1}} P_j)[1] = (P_l \xrightarrow{soc} P_l \xrightarrow{\beta^{l-1}} P_1)[1].$$

Thus $T \simeq ((\mu_1^-)^2 \circ (\mu_2^-)^2 \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{l-1}^-)^2(A))[1]$. □

Note that the indices j and l have switched places.

3.4 Mutation of type II

Assume that both ends of $j := i_{r+1}$ are vertices of degree > 1 in Γ^r, so μ_j^+ is a mutation of type II. In order to compute $\tilde{\mu}^{-(r+1)} \circ \mu_j^+ \circ \tilde{\mu}^r(A)$ we are going to consider the following three cases: 1) j is not incident to the root and there is an edge of the same level as j, following j in the cyclic ordering; 2) j is incident to the root; 3) j is not incident to the root and there is no edge of the same level as j, following j in the cyclic ordering.

Case 1: j is not incident to the root and there is an edge l of the same level as j, following j in the cyclic ordering. The edge of the next level, following j in the cyclic ordering is denoted by m.

$\Gamma = \Gamma^r$ and Γ^{r+1} are roughly of the following form (labels $\{j+1, \ldots, m-1\}$ and $\{m+1, \ldots, h\}$ are on arbitrary trees, l is not necessarily a pendant edge):



As before let us denote by $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)} = \psi(j)$ the edges which belong to the shortest path from the exceptional vertex to the edge labelled j, indexed by numbers from 1 to $\phi_\Gamma(j)$.

Claim: $\tilde{\mu}^{-(r+1)} \circ \mu_j^+ \circ \tilde{\mu}^r(A) \simeq (\mu_j^-)^2 \circ (\mu_{j+1}^-)^2 \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{m-1}^-)^2(A)$.

Proof. Let T^r be the complex from Lemma 6 associated to the tree Γ^r. Since $\phi_{\Gamma^r}(j) = \phi_{\Gamma^r}(l)$, $\phi_{\Gamma^r}(m) = \phi_{\Gamma^r}(j) + 1$ and $\psi(j) = \psi(l) = x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}$ in Γ^r, the minimal left approximation f of T^r_j is of the form:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & P_j & \xrightarrow{\beta^{j-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Id} \\ \beta^{j-l} \end{pmatrix}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{Id}} \\
P_m & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} \beta^{m-j} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}} & P_j \oplus P_l & \xrightarrow{(0,\beta^{l-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}})} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}},
\end{array}$$

since the edge corresponding to T^r_j does not belong to the exceptional cycle, hence a morphism consisting of non-zero morphisms between the respective summands is a minimal left approximation.

The following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & P_m & \xrightarrow{-\beta^{m-l}} & P_l & \longrightarrow & 0 & \\
 & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Id} \\ -\beta^{m-j} \end{pmatrix}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \mathrm{Id} \\ -\beta^{l-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \end{pmatrix}} & & \downarrow & \\
Cone(f) = & P_m \oplus P_j & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} \beta^{m-j} & \mathrm{Id} \\ 0 & \beta^{j-l} \\ 0 & -\beta^{j-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \end{pmatrix}} & P_j \oplus P_l \oplus P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} & \xrightarrow{(0,\beta^{l-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}},\mathrm{Id})} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} & \\
 & \downarrow{\scriptstyle (\mathrm{Id},0)} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle (-\beta^{j-l},\mathrm{Id},0)} & & \downarrow & \\
 & P_m & \xrightarrow{-\beta^{m-l}} & P_l & \longrightarrow & 0, &
\end{array}$$

hence $(P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-l}} P_l) \simeq (P_m \xrightarrow{-\beta^{m-l}} P_l)$ is a summand of $Cone(f)$. Clearly $Cone(f)$ is homotopic to $P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-l}} P_l$, since it is an indecomposable summand of a tilting complex.

The levels of edges in Γ^{r+1} are: $\phi_{\Gamma^{r+1}}(j) = \phi_\Gamma(j)+1$, $\phi_{\Gamma^{r+1}}(j+1) = \phi_\Gamma(j+1)+2, \ldots, \phi_{\Gamma^{r+1}}(m-1) = \phi_\Gamma(m-1)+2$, $\phi_{\Gamma^{r+1}}(m) = \phi_\Gamma(m)+1$, $\phi_{\Gamma^{r+1}}(m+1) = \phi_\Gamma(m+1), \ldots, \phi_{\Gamma^{r+1}}(h) = \phi_\Gamma(h)$, hence

$$\tilde{\mu}^{-(r+1)} = (\mu_2^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(2)} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{j-1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(j-1)} \circ (\mu_j^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(j)+1} \circ (\mu_m^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(m)+1} \circ$$

$$\circ (\mu_{j+1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(j+1)+2} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{m-1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(m-1)+2} \circ (\mu_{m+1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(m+1)} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_h^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(h)} \circ$$

$$\circ (\mu_{h+1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(h+1)} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_n^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(n)}.$$

Let us apply this sequence to the complex T^{r+1}.

Application of $(\mu_{h+1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(h+1)} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_n^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(n)}$ gives $T_n \simeq P_n, \ldots, T_{h+1} \simeq P_{h+1}$.

Application of $(\mu_h^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(h)}$: note that the edge h is pendant; if h is not incident to j, then after the application of $(\mu_h^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(h)-\phi_\Gamma(m)-1}$ the edge h becomes incident to j, the complex corresponding to that edge is $P_h \xrightarrow{\beta^{h-m}} P_m$. The minimal right approximation of this complex is the morphism from $P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-l}} P_l$ induced by $P_m \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Id}} P_m$, by Lemma 4 its cone is isomorphic to $P_h \xrightarrow{\beta^{h-l}} P_l$. The minimal right approximation of the shift of $P_h \xrightarrow{\beta^{h-l}} P_l$ is the morphism from $P_l \xrightarrow{\beta^{l-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}$ induced by $P_l \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Id}} P_l$, by Lemma 4 its cone is isomorphic to $P_h \xrightarrow{\beta^{h-l}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}$, by iterated application of Lemma 4 we get: $T_h \simeq P_h$.

Similarly, applying $(\mu_{m+1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(m+1)} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{h-1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(h-1)}$ we get:

$$T_{h-1} \simeq P_{h-1}, \ldots, T_{m+1} \simeq P_{m+1}.$$

Application of $(\mu_{m-1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(m-1)+2}$: note that the edge $m-1$ is pendant; if $m-1$ is not incident to m, then after the application of $(\mu_{m-1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(m-1)-\phi_\Gamma(m)}$ the edge $m-1$ becomes incident to m, the complex corresponding to that edge is $P_{m-1} \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-1-j}} P_j$. The minimal right approximation of this complex is the morphism (β, Id) from $P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-j}} P_j$, its cone is isomorphic to $P_m \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{m-1}$. The minimal right approximation of the shift of $P_m \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{m-1}$ is the morphism $(soc, 0)$ from $P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-l}} P_l$, its cone is isomorphic to

$$P_m \xrightarrow{\binom{-\beta^{m-l}}{soc}} P_l \oplus P_m \xrightarrow{(0,\beta)} P_{m-1}.$$

The minimal right approximation of this complex is the morphism from $P_l \xrightarrow{\beta^{l-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}$ induced by $P_l \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Id}} P_l$, by a computation analogous to Lemma 4 we get that the cone is isomorphic to

$$P_m \xrightarrow{\binom{-\beta^{m-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}}{soc}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \oplus P_m \xrightarrow{(0,\beta)} P_{m-1}.$$

Applying the remaining degrees of μ_{m-1}^- we get:

$$T_{m-1} \simeq P_m \xrightarrow{soc} P_m \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{m-1}.$$

Similarly applying $(\mu_{j+1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(j+1)+2} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{m-2}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(m-2)+2}$ we get:

$$T_{m-2} \simeq P_m \xrightarrow{soc} P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^2} P_{m-2},$$

$$\cdots$$

$$T_{j+1} \simeq P_m \xrightarrow{soc} P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-j-1}} P_{j+1}.$$

Application of $(\mu_m^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(m)+1}$: the minimal right approximation of $P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-j}} P_j$ is the morphism $(soc, 0)$ from $P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-l}} P_l$, analogously to the previous case we get:

$$T_m \simeq P_m \xrightarrow{soc} P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-j}} P_j.$$

Application of $(\mu_j^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(j)+1}$: the minimal right approximation of $P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-l}} P_l$ is the morphism from $P_l \xrightarrow{\beta^{l-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}$ induced by $P_l \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Id}} P_l$, by Lemma 4 the cone is isomorphic to $P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}$, by iterated application of Lemma 4 we get: $T_j \simeq P_m$.

Application of $(\mu_2^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(2)} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{j-1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(j-1)}$ gives $T_{j-1} \simeq P_{j-1}, \ldots, T_2 \simeq P_2$, $T_1 \simeq P_1$.

Finally, $T \simeq (\mu_j^-)^2 \circ (\mu_{j+1}^-)^2 \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{m-1}^-)^2(A)$. □

Note that the indices m and j have switched places.

Case 2: j is incident to the root. This case is analogous to the case (1). Set $P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} = 0$ in (1). Clearly $T_j^{r+1} \simeq P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-l}} P_l$. By computations similar to the case (1) we get: $\tilde{\mu}^{-(r+1)} \circ \mu_j^+ \circ \tilde{\mu}^r(A) \simeq (\mu_j^-)^2 \circ (\mu_{j+1}^-)^2 \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{m-1}^-)^2(A)$. □

Case 3: j is not incident to the root and there is no edge of the same level as j, following j in the cyclic ordering.

$\Gamma = \Gamma^r$ and Γ^{r+1} are roughly of the following form (labels $\{j+1, \ldots, m-1\}$ and $\{m+1, \ldots, h\}$ are on arbitrary trees):



As before denote by $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)} = \psi(j) = j-1$ edges belonging to the shortest path from the exceptional vertex to j indexed by numbers from 1 to $\phi_\Gamma(j)$.

Claim: $\tilde{\mu}^{-(r+1)} \circ \mu_j^+ \circ \tilde{\mu}^r(A) \simeq F_j(A)$, *where* $F_j(A)$ *is defined in the Appendix (the cyclic ordering of the edges of the Brauer star corresponding to the summands of* $F_j(A)$*is given by the linear order of these summand from the bottom to the top).*

Proof. Let us compute T_j^{r+1}. The minimal left approximation of T_j^r is

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & P_j & \xrightarrow{\beta} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{Id}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle soc} & & \downarrow \\
P_m & \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-j}} & P_j & \xrightarrow{0} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} & \xrightarrow{\beta^a} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}}.
\end{array}$$

By lemma 4

$$T_j^{r+1} \simeq P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{\beta^a} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}},$$

where $a = x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)} - x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}$.

The levels of edges in Γ^{r+1} are: $\phi_{\Gamma^{r+1}}(j) = \phi_\Gamma(j) - 1$, $\phi_{\Gamma^{r+1}}(j+1) = \phi_\Gamma(j+1), \ldots, \phi_{\Gamma^{r+1}}(m-1) = \phi_\Gamma(m-1)$, $\phi_{\Gamma^{r+1}}(m) = \phi_\Gamma(m) - 1$, $\phi_{\Gamma^{r+1}}(m+1) = \phi_\Gamma(m+1) - 2, \ldots, \phi_{\Gamma^{r+1}}(h) = \phi_\Gamma(h) - 2$, hence

$$\tilde{\mu}^{-(r+1)} = (\mu_2^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(2)} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{j-2}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(j-2)} \circ (\mu_j^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1} \circ (\mu_m^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(m)-1} \circ$$

$$\circ (\mu_{j+1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(j+1)} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{m-1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(m-1)} \circ (\mu_{m+1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(m+1)-2} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_h^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(h)-2} \circ$$

$$\circ (\mu_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(j)} \circ (\mu_{h+1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(h+1)} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_n^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(n)}.$$

Let us apply this sequence of mutations to T^{r+1}.

Applying $(\mu_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(j)} \circ (\mu_{h+1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(h+1)} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_n^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(n)}$ we get: $T_n \simeq P_n, \ldots, T_{h+1} \simeq P_{h+1}, T_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \simeq P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}$.

Application of $(\mu_h^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(h)-2}$: note that the edge h is pendant; if h is not incident to j, then after the application of $(\mu_h^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(h)-\phi_\Gamma(j)-2}$, the edge h becomes incident to j, the complex corresponding to that edge is $P_h \xrightarrow{\beta^{h-m}} P_m$. The minimal right approximation of this complex is the morphism from

$$P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{\beta^a} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}}$$

induced by $P_m \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Id}} P_m$, by Lemma 4 its cone is isomorphic to

$$P_h \xrightarrow{\beta^{h-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{\beta^a} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}}.$$

The minimal right approximation of the shift of this cone is the morphism from $P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}} \xrightarrow{\beta^b} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-2}}$ (where $b = x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1} - x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-2}$), induced by $P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Id}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}}$, by Lemma 4 its cone is isomorphic to

$$P_h \xrightarrow{\beta^{h-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{\beta^{a+b}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-2}}.$$

By iterated application of Lemma 4 we get:

$$T_h \simeq P_h \xrightarrow{\beta^{h-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}.$$

Application of $(\mu_{h-1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(h-1)-2}, \ldots, (\mu_{m+1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(m+1)-2}$ is completely similar and we get:

$$T_{h-1} \simeq P_{h-1} \xrightarrow{\beta^{h-1-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}},$$

$$\ldots$$

$$T_{m+1} \simeq P_{m+1} \xrightarrow{\beta^{m+1-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}.$$

Application of $(\mu_{m-1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(m-1)}$: if the edge $m-1$ is not incident to m, then after the application of $(\mu_{m-1}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(m-1)-\phi_\Gamma(m)}$, the edge $m-1$ becomes incident to m, the complex corresponding to that edge is $P_{m-1} \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-1-j}} P_j$. The minimal right approximation of $P_{m-1} \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-1-j}} P_j$ is the morphism (β, Id) from $P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-j}} P_j$ to $P_{m-1} \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-1-j}} P_j$, by Lemma 4 its cone is isomorphic to $P_m \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{m-1}$. The minimal right approximation of $P_m \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{m-1}$ is the morphism $(soc, 0, 0, 0)$ from

$$P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{\beta^a} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}}$$

to $P_m \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{m-1}$, its cone is

$$P_m \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -\beta^{m-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\ soc \end{pmatrix}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \oplus P_m \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -soc & 0 \\ 0 & \beta \end{pmatrix}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \oplus P_{m-1} \xrightarrow{(-\beta^a, 0)} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}}.$$

The minimal right approximation of the shift of this complex is the morphism from $P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}} \xrightarrow{\beta^b} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-2}}$ induced by $P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Id}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}}$, by Lemma 4 its cone is isomorphic to

$$P_m \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -\beta^{m-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\ soc \end{pmatrix}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \oplus P_m \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -soc & 0 \\ 0 & \beta \end{pmatrix}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \oplus P_{m-1} \xrightarrow{(-\beta^{a+b}, 0)} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-2}}.$$

By iterated application of Lemma 4 we get:

$$T_{m-1} \simeq P_m \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -\beta^{m-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\ soc \end{pmatrix}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \oplus P_m \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -soc & 0 \\ 0 & \beta \end{pmatrix}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \oplus P_{m-1}.$$

Similarly,

$$T_{m-2} \simeq P_m \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -\beta^{m-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\ soc \end{pmatrix}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \oplus P_m \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -soc & 0 \\ 0 & \beta^2 \end{pmatrix}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \oplus P_{m-2},$$

$$\ldots$$

$$T_{j+1} \simeq P_m \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -\beta^{m-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\ soc \end{pmatrix}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \oplus P_m \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -soc & 0 \\ 0 & \beta^{m-j-1} \end{pmatrix}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \oplus P_{j+1}.$$

Application of $(\mu_m^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(m)-1}$: the minimal right approximation of $P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-j}} P_j$ is the morphism $(soc, 0, 0, 0)$ from

$$P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{\beta^a} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}}$$

to $P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-j}} P_j$, similar to the previous case we get:

$$T_m \simeq P_m \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -\beta^{m-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\ soc \end{pmatrix}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \oplus P_m \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -soc & 0 \\ 0 & \beta^{m-j} \end{pmatrix}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \oplus P_j.$$

Application of $(\mu_j^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}$: the minimal right approximation of

$$P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{\beta} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}}$$

is the morphism from $P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}} \xrightarrow{\beta^b} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-2}}$, induced by $P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Id}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)-1}}$, by iterated application of Lemma 4 we get:

$$T_j \simeq P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}.$$

Application of $(\mu_2^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(2)} \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{j-2}^-)^{\phi_\Gamma(j-2)}$ clearly gives

$$T_{j-2} \simeq P_{j-2}, \ldots, T_2 \simeq P_2, T_1 \simeq P_1.$$

□

Claim: $F_j(A) = (\mu_h^+)^2 \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{m+1}^+)^2 \circ (\mu_j^-)^2 \circ (\mu_{j+1}^-)^2 \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{m-1}^-)^2 \circ (\mu_m^+)^2 \circ (\mu_{m-1}^+)^2 \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_j^+)^2(A)$.

Proof. Let us apply to $F_j(A)$ the inverse sequence of mutations. If we obtain A, the claim is proved. Let us compute a double mutation of T_h along $T_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}$. The minimal right approximation of T_h is the morphism from $T_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}$ to T_h induced by $P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Id}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}$, by Lemma 4 its cone is isomorphic to $P_h \xrightarrow{\beta^{h-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}$; after applying the shift $P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}$ is concentrated in the same degree as in $T_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}$, applying Lemma 4 one more time we get:

$$[(\mu_h^-)^2(F_j(A))]_h \simeq P_h.$$

Similarly,

$$[(\mu_{h-1}^-)^2 \circ (\mu_h^-)^2(F_j(A))]_{h-1} \simeq P_{h-1}$$

$$\cdots$$

$$[(\mu_{m+1}^-)^2 \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{h-1}^-)^2 \circ (\mu_h^-)^2(F_j(A))]_{m+1} \simeq P_{m+1}.$$

Let us denote the complex $(\mu_{m+1}^-)^2 \circ \cdots \circ (\mu_{h-1}^-)^2 \circ (\mu_h^-)^2(F_j(A))$ by T^r.

Recall that the homotopy category can be defined as the stable category of the Frobenius category of complexes with respect to degree-wise split short

exact sequences. So the distinguished triangles in the homotopy category come from degree-wise split short exact sequences [8].

Let us compute a double mutation of T_m along T_j. Consider the following degree-wise split short exact sequence in the category of complexes:



where f is clearly a minimal left approximation of T_m with respect to other summands of T^r. So $Cone(f) \simeq (P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-j}} P_j)$ concentrated in the corresponding degree. The minimal left approximation of $Cone(f)$ with respect to other summands of T^{r+1} is the morphism to

$$T_j = P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}$$

induced by $(\mathrm{Id}, \beta^{j-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}})$, by Lemma 4 its cone is isomorphic to

$$[(\mu_m^+)^2(T^r)]_m \simeq P_j \xrightarrow{\beta^{j-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}.$$

Similarly,

$$[(\mu_{j+1}^+)^2 \circ (\mu_m^+)^2(T^r)]_{j+1} \simeq P_{j+1} \xrightarrow{\beta^{j+1-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}$$

$$\dots$$

$$[(\mu_{m-1}^+)^2 \circ \dots \circ (\mu_{j+1}^+)^2 \circ (\mu_m^+)^2(T^r))]_{m-1} \simeq P_{m-1} \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-1-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \xrightarrow{soc} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}.$$

So we have:

$$(\mu_{m-1}^+)^2 \circ \dots \circ (\mu_{j+1}^+)^2 \circ (\mu_m^+)^2 \circ (\mu_{m+1}^-)^2 \circ \dots \circ (\mu_{h-1}^-)^2 \circ (\mu_h^-)^2(F_j(A)) \simeq G_j(A),$$

where $G_j(A)$ is defined in the Appendix (the cyclic ordering of the edges corresponding to the summands of $G_j(A)$ in the Brauer star is defined by the linear order of these summands from the bottom to the top).

Applying $(\mu_j^-)^2$ to G_j we get $[(\mu_j^-)^2(G_j)]_j \simeq P_m$.

Similarly,

$$[(\mu_{m-1}^-)^2 \circ (\mu_j^-)^2(G_j)]_{m-1} \simeq P_{m-1}$$

$$\dots$$
$$[(\mu_{j+1}^-)^2 \circ \dots (\mu_{m-1}^-)^2 \circ (\mu_j^-)^2(G_j)]_{j+1} \simeq P_{j+1}$$
$$[(\mu_m^-)^2 \circ (\mu_{j+1}^-)^2 \circ \dots (\mu_{m-1}^-)^2 \circ (\mu_j^-)^2(G_j)]_m \simeq P_j.$$

So $(\mu_m^-)^2 \circ (\mu_{j+1}^-)^2 \circ \dots (\mu_{m-1}^-)^2 \circ (\mu_j^-)^2(G_j) \simeq A$.

Note that in the resulting copy of A the cyclic ordering of the projective modules is standard, but the labelling is not: j and m have switched their places. Hence the assertion follows. □

This finishes the proof of Theorem 3.

3.5 Multiplicity free case

Let A be a Brauer star algebra of type $(n, 1)$. Consider a subgroup $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ of the derived Picard group of A generated by shift, $\mathrm{Pic}(A)$, equivalences H_i and equivalences Q_i, where Q_i are some standard equivalences acting on the indecomposable projective modules as follows:

$$Q_i(P_j) = \begin{cases} 0 \to P_i \to 0, & j = i \\ 0 \to P_i \xrightarrow{\beta^{i-j}} P_j, & j \neq i, \end{cases}$$

where P_i are concentrated in degree 0.

Remark 4. *The group generated by Q_i was considered by Muchtadi-Alamsyah in [14]. It has an action of the braid group whose associated Coxeter group is given by the complete graph on n vertices, but this action is not faithful.*

Remark 5. *It is clear that $Q_i(A) \simeq \mu_{i+1}^- \circ \mu_{i+2}^- \circ \dots \circ \mu_{i-2}^- \circ \mu_{i-1}^-(A)$, this series of mutations changes the central vertex of the Brauer star to the outer vertex of the edge labelled i. It is also clear that one can obtain Q_i from Q_{i+1} by conjugation with the automorphism corresponding to the rotation of the Brauer star. Note also that Q_i^2 does not change the central vertex of the Brauer star, hence $Q_i^2 \in \mathcal{R}$.*

Theorem 4. *If $t = 1$, then* $\mathrm{TrPic}(A) = \tilde{\mathcal{R}}$.

Proof. Since $Q_i(A) \simeq \mu_{i+1}^- \circ \mu_{i+2}^- \circ \dots \circ \mu_{i-2}^- \circ \mu_{i-1}^-(A)$, the summands of $Q_i(A)$ can be computed as cones of minimal approximations of projective modules. Similar to the computation of $F(H_i(A))$, in order to compute $F(Q_i(A))$ for some autoequivalence F one can apply the sequence of mutations $\mu_{i+1}^- \circ \mu_{i+2}^- \circ \dots \circ \mu_{i-2}^- \circ \mu_{i-1}^-$ to $F(A)$.

As before, it is sufficient to prove that for any tilting complex T such that $\mathrm{End}_{D^b(A)}(T)^{op} \simeq A$ there is an element from $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ which sends the indecomposable projective A-modules to the summands of T. Assume that T is concentrated in non-positive degrees. By results of Aihara [2] $T = \mu_{i_s}^+ \circ \dots \circ \mu_{i_{r+1}}^+ \circ \mu_{i_r}^+ \circ \mu_{i_{r-1}}^+ \circ \dots \circ \mu_{i_2}^+ \circ \mu_{i_1}^+(A)$ for some $(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_s)$. If the series of mutations $\mu_{i_s}^+ \circ \dots \circ \mu_{i_{r+1}}^+ \circ \mu_{i_r}^+ \circ \mu_{i_{r-1}}^+ \circ \dots \circ \mu_{i_2}^+ \circ \mu_{i_1}^+(A)$ does not change the central vertex of the Brauer

star, then by calculations of the previous section the standard equivalence F such that $F(A) \simeq T$ belongs to $\mathcal{R}$ and hence to $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$. If the series of mutations changes the central vertex of the Brauer star to the outer vertex of the edge labelled i, then applying $\mu_{i+1}^- \circ \mu_{i+2}^- \circ \cdots \circ \mu_{i-2}^- \circ \mu_{i-1}^-$ we obtain a tilting complex T' such that there is some $F' \in \mathcal{R}$, $F'(A) \simeq T'$. So we have $T' \simeq F \circ Q_i(A)$, hence F belongs to $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$. □

Remark 6. *As in the case $t > 1$, the question of the relations in $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ remains open.*

Remark 7. *It seems that the action of the derived Picard group on the edges of the Brauer star can not be defined properly, since in many examples of computations we have found two sequences of mutations which give the same tilting complex but act differently on the edges of the Brauer star.*

4 Appendix

$$F_j = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \\ \vdots \\ T_{j-2} \\ T_j \\ T_m \\ T_{j+1} \\ \vdots \\ T_{m-1} \\ T_{m+1} \\ \vdots \\ T_h \\ T_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\ T_{h+1} \\ \vdots \\ T_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} & & & P_1 \\ & & & P_2 \\ & & & \vdots \\ & & & P_{j-2} \\ P_m \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} & \xrightarrow{soc} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\ P_m \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -\beta^{m-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\ soc \end{pmatrix}} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \oplus P_m & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -soc & 0 \\ 0 & \beta^{m-j} \end{pmatrix}} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \oplus P_j \\ P_m \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -\beta^{m-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\ soc \end{pmatrix}} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \oplus P_m & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -soc & 0 \\ 0 & \beta^{m-j-1} \end{pmatrix}} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \oplus P_{j+1} \\ & & & \vdots \\ P_m \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -\beta^{m-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\ soc \end{pmatrix}} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \oplus P_m & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -soc & 0 \\ 0 & \beta \end{pmatrix}} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \oplus P_{m-1} \\ P_{m+1} \xrightarrow{\beta^{m+1-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} & \xrightarrow{soc} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\ & & & \vdots \\ P_h \xrightarrow{\beta^{h-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} & \xrightarrow{soc} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\ & & & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\ & & & P_{h+1} \\ & & & \vdots \\ & & & P_n \end{pmatrix}$$

$$G_j = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \\ \vdots \\ T_{j-2} \\ T_m \\ T_{j+1} \\ \vdots \\ T_{m-1} \\ T_j \\ T_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\ T_{m+1} \\ \vdots \\ T_h \\ T_{h+1} \\ \vdots \\ T_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} & & & P_1 \\ & & & P_2 \\ & & & \vdots \\ & & & P_{j-2} \\ P_j & \xrightarrow{\beta^{j-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} & \xrightarrow{soc} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\ P_{j+1} & \xrightarrow{\beta^{j+1-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} & \xrightarrow{soc} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\ & & & \vdots \\ P_{m-1} & \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-1-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} & \xrightarrow{soc} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\ P_m & \xrightarrow{\beta^{m-x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}}} & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} & \xrightarrow{soc} P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\ & & & P_{x_{\phi_\Gamma(j)}} \\ & & & P_{m+1} \\ & & & \vdots \\ & & & P_h \\ & & & P_{h+1} \\ & & & \vdots \\ & & & P_n \end{pmatrix}$$

References

[1] Aihara, T. (2010). Mutating Brauer trees. arXiv preprint arXiv:1009.3210.

[2] Aihara, T. (2013). Tilting-connected symmetric algebras. Algebras and Representation Theory, 16(3), 873–894.

[3] Aihara, T., Iyama, O. (2012). Silting mutation in triangulated categories. J. of the London Math. Soc., 85(3), 633–668.

[4] Antipov, M. (2007) Derived equivalence of symmetric special biserial algebras. Zap. Nauchn. Sem. POMI 343, 5–32, 272; translation in J. Math. Sci. (N. Y.) 147 , no. 5, 6981–6994.

[5] Bolla., M. (1984) Isomorphisms between endomorphism rings of progenerators. J. Algebra, 87.1, 261–281.

[6] Dugas, A. (2011). Tilting mutation of weakly symmetric algebras and stable equivalence. Algebras and Representation Theory, 1–22.

[7] Gabriel, P., Riedtmann, C. (1979). Group representations without groups. Comment. Math. Helvetici, 54(1), 240–287.

[8] Happel, D. (1988). Triangulated categories in the representation of finite dimensional algebras (Vol. 119). Cambridge University Press.

[9] Kauer, M. (1998). Derived equivalence of graph algebras. Contemporary Mathematics, 229, 201–214.

[10] Keller, B. (1993). A remark on tilting theory and DG algebras. Manuscripta mathematica, 79(1), 247–252.

[11] Khovanov, M., Seidel, P. (2002). Quivers, Floer cohomology, and braid group actions. J. Amer. Math. Soc., 15(1), 203–271.

[12] Konig, S., Zimmermann, A. (1997). Tilting selfinjective algebras and Gorenstein orders. Quarterly Journal of Mathematics, 48(191), 351–362.

[13] Marsh, R. J., Schroll, S. (2013). The geometry of Brauer graph algebras and cluster mutations. arXiv preprint arXiv:1309.4239.

[14] Muchtadi-Alamsyah, I. (2008). Braid Action on Derived Category Nakayama Algebras. Commun. Algebra, 36(7), 2544–2569.

[15] Rickard, J. (1989). Derived categories and stable equivalence. J. of pure and applied Algebra, 61(3), 303–317.

[16] Rickard, J. (1991). Derived equivalences as derived functors. J. London Math. Soc.(2), 43(1), 37–48.

[17] Rickard, J. (1989). Morita theory for derived categories. J. London Math. Soc.(2), 39(3), 436–456.

[18] Rouquier, R., Zimmermann, A. (2003). Picard groups for derived module categories. Proc. London Math. Soc., 87(01), 197–225.

[19] Schaps, M., Zakay-Illouz, E. (2002). Braid group action on the refolded tilting complex of the Brauer star algebra. Proceedings ICRA IX (2), 434–449.

[20] Schaps, M., Zakay-Illouz, E. (2001). Pointed brauer trees. J. Algebra, 246(2), 647–672.

[21] Zimmermann, A. (2001). Self-equivalences of the derived category of Brauer tree algebras with exceptional vertex. Analele Stiintifice ale Universitatii Ovidius, 9(1), 139–148.